



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MUSONIUS THE ETRUSCAN.

BY CHARLES POMEROY PARKER.

THE purpose of this article is to examine afresh the evidence about Musonius Rufus. According to his contemporary, Tacitus, he was of Etruscan descent and of equestrian rank, a teacher of Stoic philosophy to young men. His name is associated with Rubellius Plautus, a man of imperial rank. He was the prosecutor of Egnatius Celer, for treachery to Celer's disciple and friend Barea Soranus. This fact, when we consider the friendship of Soranus with Rubellius, makes probable a connection with Soranus himself. Moreover Annius Pollio, the husband of Soranus's daughter, was banished at the same time with Musonius, after Calpurnius Piso's conspiracy. Piso Licinianus, afterwards Galba's adopted son, and Cornelius Laco, Galba's praetorian prefect, met as friends in Rubellius's house and may easily have known Musonius there. Musonius was influential in Rome after Galba's success. Vespasian, if we may trust Dio Cassius, honored him so greatly as to retain him in Rome when he banished the other philosophers. St. Jerome indeed says that Musonius was recalled by Titus from exile a.u.c. 833 (Suetonius, Roth, p. 301. 38). But either of these statements, if correct, shows him to have been a man likely to be honored by emperors, and Themistius says (p. 212. 13, Dindorf): *συνῆν . . . Τίτος Μουσωνίῳ τῷ Τυρρηνῷ*.

We must now notice the character and behavior of the professed Stoics who associated with Musonius. Rubellius Plautus cultivated the theories of life held by Romans of an earlier time; his deportment and dress were somewhat ascetic (*habitu severo*, Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 22), and his life retired. Yet he was suspected of a desire for political activity. Barea Soranus, who in later life was under Stoic influence, had shown in his Asiatic proconsulship an industrious

attention to the details of his office and an independence on the side of justice, both of which may have arisen from a desire to carry Stoic philosophy into ordinary public life. Egnatius Celer, the teacher of Soranus, had adopted, it would appear, the deportment, dress, beard, and ascetic expression of an extreme Stoic (*habitu et ore ad exprimendam imaginem honesti exercitus*, Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 32). Piso in dress and face kept to the old Roman way; his expression and deportment were of an ascetic cast (*vultu habituque moris antiqui, ex aestimatione recta severus, deterius interpretantibus tristior*, Tac. *Hist.* i. 14; on his promotion Tacitus represents him as preserving a calm, restrained expression and manner, *nullum turbati aut exsultantis animi motum prodidisse . . . nihil in vultu habituque mutatum*.—*Ibid.* 17). Evidently we are here introduced to a stern, serious company of men of high rank, who desired to restore the old simple Roman life, morality, and discipline, under the inspiration of Greek, but not merely Greek, philosophy; who were waiting quietly through the wild riot of the court in Nero's time till their turn should come. Musonius was presumably somewhat like them in dress and behavior as well as in ideals; but we must note in him a willingness to work with men who were not philosophers, if their influence tended on the whole to improvement, such as Vespasian and Titus. He is ready to punish offenders. His purpose is political as well as moral. His surroundings are Italian.

This man is probably the same as the C. Musonius of whom Pliny the younger says (*Ep.* iii. 11) *quantum licitum est per aetatem cum admiratione dilexi*. Pliny also speaks of this Musonius as father-in-law of one Artemidorus, a philosopher to whom he himself was a close friend. The difficulty of age lay probably only in Pliny's extreme youth at the time of Musonius's death, as Pliny had no difficulty in cultivating friendships with old men afterwards. Musonius, therefore, probably died early in Domitian's reign. At any rate, if Musonius had lived on to the gloomy later days of Domitian, it seems likely that we should have heard of him again from Pliny, who says so much of the famous victims and survivors of that time. The other reference to one Musonius Bassus (*Ep.* vii. 31), of which Nieuwland makes so much, would appear to be based on a false reading. A consultation of Keil's critical note will indicate that the

original reading may well have been "*tum in his anni bassi*," corrupted into "*tum musanni bassi*" and so into "*tum Musonii Bassi*." And in any case the surname cannot be Rufus.

The Rufus quoted by Arrian's Epictetus is generally assumed to be Musonius Rufus. If Epictetus was expelled from Rome in 89 or 90 A.D. he might before his expulsion have studied with Musonius in Rome. The six mentions of Rufus in the *Discourses* carry us right to the heart of Rome in the lifetime of Musonius. Thrasea is mentioned as in conversation with him and rebuked by him, the burning of the Capitol is referred to by a pupil as a typical crime, the murder of Galba comes up in a philosophic connection. Moreover, there is a marked sternness and seriousness in the man revealed by five of the six passages. Character, time, place, all agree with what we should expect in Musonius the Etruscan. Nor do we know of any other Rufus to whom we could assign the profession of teaching philosophy. Accepting, then, this identification, we learn from Epictetus some other important facts about our philosopher's teaching. His attitude of complete indifference to life or death is shown in his epigram to Thrasea (Epict. *Dissert.* i. 1. 27). The importance he attached to correct syllogistic reasoning is seen in the anecdote anent the burning of the Capitol (i. 7. 32). Syllogistic study will encourage a philosophy which insists largely on consistency of actions with first principles, such as was developed by Epictetus after his teacher. The third extract given by Peerlkamp teaches the strong lesson of reliance on self for all good; the slave depends not one whit upon the master (i. 9. 29). Fourthly, we learn how Rufus repelled pupils in order to test the excellence of their nature (iii. 6. 10). Another reference shows what a heart-searching moral insight into his listeners' faults there was in his speech (iii. 23. 29). The remaining extract, referring to Galba, seems to repel the idea that Rufus could ever base the proof of divine providence on any political success (iii. 15. 14). The severity of the teaching above described confirms our opinion that the teacher of Epictetus was Musonius the Etruscan.

But as regards the extracts made from one Musonius by Stobaeus, the case is by no means so clear. As preliminary to the discussion we may note that the extracts of Stobaeus given by Peerlkamp all seem correctly ascribed to some Musonius, except the long one

which he heads "*Quid vacuum doloris faciat*," and the two short ones beginning respectively *Θεόδωρος* and *Kakiaus*. There seems no authority in the manuscripts for connecting the name of Musonius with these. Taking, however, the others, long and short, what sort of a man do they reveal to us, and into what surroundings do they take us? There is not the slightest hint of any presence in Rome, or of any connection of the speaker with Roman traditions. Speaking of agriculture he quotes Theognis, and refers to Hesiod, Myson, and Psophidius the Arcadian. Speaking of exile he quotes Socrates, Euripides, and Heraclitus, and refers to Diogenes, Spartacus the Lacedaemonian, Odysseus, Themistocles, Dion, Aristides, and Clearchus. Speaking of marriage and the family he refers to the names of Pythagoras, Socrates, Crates, and Admetus. On woman's life he mentions Eriphyle, the Amazons, and Socrates; on luxury, Lycurgus, another Laconian, Zeno of Citium, Heraclitus, and Socrates; on old age, Isocrates. Surely on all these subjects there were also Roman illustrations ready for a man living in the heart of the Roman empire, the friend of noble Romans. The beard is discussed, and no reference is made to the old bearded Romans (*moris antiqui*), whom presumably the friends of Rufus tried to imitate. The garments spoken of are the *χιτών* and *ἱμάτιον*. The following sentence also suggests a Greek city rather than Rome: οὔτε γὰρ πομπὴν πεμπομένην θεοῖς οὕτω καλὴν θεάσασθαι' ἂν τις, οὔτε χορείαν ἐπὶ ἱεροῖς κόσμῳ χορευόντων οὕτως ἀξιοθέατον, ὥς χορὸν παίδων πολλῶν προηγούμενων ἐν πόλει πατὴρ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν ἢ μητὴρ, χειραγωγούντων τοὺς γονεῖς ἢ τρόπον ἕτερον περιεπόντων κηδεμονικῶς (Stobaeus *Flor.*, Meineke, lxxv. 15). Again, reference is made to the mystic initiation rites as one of a man's regular duties: διὰ θεοὺς ἔστιν ὅτε πονητέον τῷ δικαίῳ εἶναι βουλομένῳ πρὸς θεοὺς, ὅτι θυσίας ἢ τελετὰς ἢ τινα ἄλλην ὑπηρεσίαν τελήσει τοῖς θεοῖς (*Ibid.* lxxxv. 20); this seems Greek and not Roman. Again, prominence is given to Ἔρως between Ἥρα and Ἀφροδίτη in a discussion on marriage (*Ibid.* lxvii. 20); Cupido would not be so placed by a Roman in a prosaic discussion. Again (in lxxv. 15) Ζεὺς ὁμόγνιος is referred to; this epithet does not seem natural in the mouth of an Italian, or to be a translation of any Italian name. In fact the setting of all these discussions is entirely Greek. The arguments, too, are in a different tone from the master of Epictetus.

They are inductive rather than deductive. They appeal to the natural instincts rather than to consistency. They welcome the listener with geniality instead of repelling him with severity. They deal with the common duties of everyday life, rather than with the prospect of death. They talk of the joys of family life rather than of the problems of Providence. They search out the good in a disciple rather than his weakness and evil. They speak of the beautiful, the healthy, the useful, and the divine rather than of self-sufficiency. In fact, a careful pondering of Epictetus's six references to Rufus, and an observation of the way in which Epictetus developed his teaching on these lines as laid down by Rufus, will make one seriously doubt whether the Musonius of Stobaeus can be Musonius Rufus the Etruscan. We find in Stobaeus five extracts headed Ρούφου ἐκ τῶν Ἐπικτήτου περὶ φιλίας. Possibly Stobaeus knew one man as Rufus and another as Musonius. Now can we find anything about such another man?

One of the Stobaeus extracts (see Wachsmuth and Hense, Lib. II, cap. xv. 46) is headed Λυκίου ἐκ τῶν Μουσωνίου. Perhaps all these extracts are from memoirs written by one Lucius. Certainly in the Lives of the Sophists by Philostratus, ii. 9 (Kayser, p. 64) there is mention of a Lucius who entered into counsel with Herodes Atticus. Of him says Philostratus: ἦν μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς φανεροῖς σπουδαῖος ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος, Μουσωνίῳ δὲ τῷ Τυρίῳ προσφιλοφήσας εὐσκόπως εἶχε τῶν ἀποκρίσεων καὶ τὸ ἐπίχαρι σὺν καιρῷ ἐπετίθενεν. This disciple of a Musonius may well be the author of the Stobaeus memoirs, and at any rate studied with some one of that name. Now if the anecdote on the next page about Marcus Aurelius is true or even probable, its date must be after 161, when the emperor was forty years of age; otherwise the epithet γηράσκων on which the whole story hangs would have no meaning. But Lucius at that time can hardly have been more than eighty years old, and was more probably younger than that. If he was born after 80 A.D., he cannot have studied with Musonius the Etruscan unless that philosopher outlived Domitian, which, as we saw above, does not seem probable. But even if Musonius Rufus lived to the reign of Trajan, since he must have been at least forty to have such a position as he had at the time of his exile, he would be over seventy at the accession of that emperor. We should

have to suppose that Lucius, between twenty and thirty, studied with this venerable man between seventy-five and eighty-five, and reported his genial conversations. On the whole, especially considering the likelihood of the Etruscan's earlier death, we shall do better to suppose that there was another Musonius called the Tyrian, who flourished in the reign of Trajan or of Hadrian. This Tyrian, like other orientals, may have been of Greek extraction and may have come to Athens or some other Greek city to live ; or he may have travelled from city to city according to a common custom. Long residence in Greek towns would account for the Grecian tone of his philosophy. He then would be the Musonius who made the Greek epigram on the beggar and self-styled philosopher of which Gellius heard Herodes Atticus tell (*Noct. Attic.*, ed. Hertz, ix. 2-8). His would be the Greek epigram on pleasure and pain after the same thought of Cato the Censor (*N. A.* xvi. 1). He may have known and imitated Cato, for he seems to have known enough Latin to make a Latin play upon words (*N. A.* xviii. 2. 1). His would be the enlargement of Rufus's epigram showing that praise by the listener is a proof of the nothingness of the teacher (*N. A.* v. 1). This second Musonius, living in the beginning of the second century, would be the man of whom Justin Martyr wrote as of a contemporary, ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς, and of whom Origen seems to speak as a generation or two before him, τῶν χθὲς καὶ πρόην γεγονότων. Or if we do not wish to press Origen's words, at least we may suppose that he would be more interested in a Greek oriental than in an Italian. The passages of these two authors are worth transcribing in full.

Justin (*Apol.* ii. 8, Otto, Jena, 1847) says : καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Στωικῶν δὲ δογματῶν, ἐπεὶ δὴ καὶ (κατα?) τὸν ἡθικὸν λόγον κόσμιοι γεγονάσι, ὡς καὶ ἐν τισιν οἱ ποιηταί, διὰ τὸ ἔμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου, μεμισθῆσθαι καὶ πεφονεύσθαι οἶδαμεν. Ἡράκλειτον μὲν ὡς προέφημεν, καὶ Μουσώνιον δὲ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄλλους οἶδαμεν. ὡς γὰρ σημάνομεν πάντας τοὺς καὶ ὅπως δὴ ποτε κατὰ λόγον βιοῦν σπονδάζοντας καὶ κακίαν φεύγειν μισεῖσθαι αἰεὶ ἐνήργησαν οἱ δαίμονες. Musonius the Etruscan who was banished for a few years to Gyara, and was afterwards an emperor's friend, cannot without more than exaggeration be said to be of the type of men hated and killed. But one who lived a

life of poverty, far below Roman equestrian rank, yet became prominent as a philosophic teacher of righteousness, might, if confounded with the Cynics of the time, have aroused hatred, and might even have been killed in a riot in some Asiatic Greek city. Origen's words are (*Contra Celsum* iii. 66, ed. Lommatzsch, Berlin, 1845) εἰσὶ γὰρ καὶ κατὰ πᾶσαν φιλοσοφίας αἵρεσιν, καὶ κατὰ τὸν θεῖον λόγον, οἱ τοσοῦτον μεταβεβληκέναι ἱστορούμενοι, ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἐγκεῖσθαι παράδειγμα τοῦ ἀρίστου βίου. καὶ φέρουσι τινες ἡρώων μὲν τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεά· τῶν δὲ ὕστερον, τὸν Σωκράτην· τῶν δὲ χθὲς καὶ πρῶν γεγονότων τὸν Μουσώνιον. The man who had lived the life revealed in the Stobaeus extracts might well be set alongside of Socrates. The Roman knight, the prosecutor of Egnatius Celer, the friend of Titus, can hardly have seemed to Origen an example of the best life, a saint of the heathen dispensation. Clement of Alexandria would also seem to have known the Stobaeus Musonius. (See Wendland, *Quaestiones Musonianae: De Musonio Stoico Clementis Alexandrini aliorumque auctore*, Berlin, 1886.) Some connection between the two men seems to be proved by Wendland's dissertation whether we accept or not his theory that Clement used his predecessor's work as the substance of his own *Paedagogus*. In some later inquiry we may examine the relation of the Greek oriental Musonius to Clement, and to other Christian and heathen writers, taking as our starting point Wendland's discussion. But in speaking of the Etruscan we may set aside all discussion of the Tyrian, except so far as is necessary to distinguish one from the other.

There is, however, another complication. Philostratus mentions also one Musonius the Babylonian: Μουσώνιος ὁ βαβυλώνιος, ἀνὴρ Ἀπολλωνίου μόνον δεύτερος ἐδέθη ἐπὶ σοφία καὶ ἐκεῖ μένων ἐκινδύνευσεν, ἀπέθανε δ' ἂν τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ δήσαντι, εἰ μὴ σφόδρα ἔρρωτο (Philost. *Apollon.* iv. 35, Kayser, vol. I, p. 153). And again (iv. 46, p. 164): Μουσώνιος κατελημμένος ἐν τοῖς δεσμωτηρίοις τοῦ Νέρωνος, ὃν φασὶ τελεώτατα ἀνθρώπων φιλοσοφῆσαι. He goes on to incorporate in his text a few short letters supposed to have passed between him and Apollonius; but these need not detain us now. We note that the man described as the most perfect philosopher, second only to Apollonius, seems like the typical good man of Origen; moreover the persecution of him by Nero might be part of the hatred referred to by Justin. If it were

not for his being called the Babylonian instead of the Tyrian we might suppose that a young man, who when about twenty years of age did some bold act which drew on him Nero's punishment, lived to be seventy at the accession of Hadrian and was alive in the early days of Herodes Atticus, Lucius, and Justin. If he spent his later life in Greece and Asia he might be no more mentioned by Pliny than were Plutarch and Epictetus. What else then does Philostratus say of him? In *Apollon*. v. 19, p. 178, Demetrius the Cynic is mentioned as finding Musonius in chains at the Isthmus occupied in digging; the work would be Nero's canal. Musonius is represented as saying *λυτῶ σε ὦ Δημήτριε, τὸν Ἴσθμὸν ὀρύττων τῇ Ἑλλάδι; εἰ δὲ καὶ καθαρωδοῦντα με εἶδες, ὥσπερ Νέρωνα, τί ἂν ἔπαθες;* If this story has any historical foundation or possibility, we can hardly refer it to Musonius the Etruscan (Tyrrhenian), who in a later book (vii. 16, p. 271) is said to have been banished to Gyara; who is not said by any authority to have been put in chains; who is not likely as a Roman knight to have been ordered to the work of digging the canal; who shows no sign of harmony with Demetrius, and who takes quite a different line towards Egnatius Celer and Vespasian. (See Tacitus, Dio Cassius, Suetonius, *passim*.) The same connection of one Musonius with Nero, with Isthmus digging, and with Nero's music, is seen in the dialogue printed by Kayser with the works of Philostratus, and by Jacobitz doubtfully with those of Lucian. Here, however, Menecrates and not Demetrius is the interlocutor. In Themistius we find traces of other parts of the same tradition. He says: *Νέρων Μουσώνιον ἐξεκήρυττε, καὶ εἵργε τὸν ἐκ Τυάωνων ὁ ἀδελφοκτόνος* (86. 19, Dindorf, 1832). Here is the connection with Apollonius of Tyana. Again, *καλῶς Νέρωνα ἀπετρέπετο Μουσώνιος καθαρωδοῦντα* (460. 8, Dindorf). It would appear that Musonius got into trouble from some bold protest against Nero's artistic display. Again: *Νέρωνος μὲν αἰδοῖμος ἢ πρὸς Μουσώνιον ἐπιείκεια* (112. 12, Dindorf). To let off an oriental with his life and hard labor might be easy treatment, but to put chains upon a Roman knight could not be called *ἐπιείκεια* by any but a flatterer of Nero. Still such boldness of speech might win fame even for a young oriental. There is no sign in Themistius that this man is the Etruscan; whereas the orator does give this epithet to the friend of Titus: *συνὴν Τίτος*

Μουσωνίῳ τῷ Τυρρηνῷ (212. 23, Dindorf). The Babylonian is probably the man referred to by Lucian *De Morte Peregrini* 18. Peregrinus (Proteus) is there banished from Rome, and gets great renown as ὁ φιλόσοφος διὰ τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὴν ἄγαν ἐλευθερίαν ἐξελαθείς. καὶ προσέλαυνε κατὰ τοῦτο τῷ Μουσωνίῳ καὶ Δίωνι καὶ Ἐπικτήτῳ. The Etruscan was perhaps less famous for boldness of speech than for discretion. But now as to the identity of the Babylonian, we may note that the emperor Julian is likely to have mentioned without title the same whom Themistius knows as simply Musonius. He says (*Epist. ad Themistium* 22): Μουσώνιος ἐξ ὧν ἔπαθεν ἀνδρείως, καὶ νῆ Δι' ἠνεγκεν ἐγκρατῶς τὴν τῶν τυράννων ὁμότητα, γέγονε γνῶριμος, ἴσως οὐκ ἐλάττων εὐδαιμονῶν ἐκείνων τῶν τὰς μεγάλας ἐπιτροπενυσάντων βασιλείας. Again in 7 of the same letter he mentions Musonius in a comparison of the theoretic and the practical life. Such descriptions, however, apply equally well to the Tyrian. I strongly suspect that these two are really one man. Each of the epithets is at least oriental, and may have come from a double residence, or from origin in one and long residence in the other city. This oriental, after his first bold attempt in a young man's enthusiasm to stop the disgraceful career of Nero by converting him, may always afterwards have used boldness of speech against vice, and yet have shown in the conversations of later life with Lucius that genial good sense and enthusiasm for right living which characterize the Stobaeian dialogues. Indeed, only a man with great faith in human nature could have tried to turn Nero (ἀπέτρεπε) to self-respect. Yet in spite of geniality, if he dared to tell the truth, he might well have incurred the enmity of powerful men, or of mobs, and have been put to death. This man, however, does not belong with the political Stoics; he is more like a Christian. The Christian writers seem to have felt this, to have appreciated his life, studied his words, and looked on him as a Greek saint preparing the way for the progress of Christianity as truly as did the Hebrew prophets. For the present, however, we turn from him to the Roman knight.

Let us then, if we have disentangled the evidence rightly, arrange chronologically the facts of his life. He was born at least as early as 25 A.D. When therefore Seneca returned from exile and began his work of applying Stoic philosophy to imperial politics,

Musonius may have been speculating in a more republican and freer spirit. By the beginning of Nero's reign he may have begun to gather pupils about him; at the time of Rubellius Plautus's death, A.D. 62, he was influential, and probably famous, as was certainly the case at his exile three years later. In order to see what his doctrine was we must add to the six passages in Arrian, five given by Stobaeus under the title 'Ρούφου ἐκ τῶν [τοῦ] Ἐπικτήτου περὶ φιλίας. First comes the doctrine so often maintained by Epictetus: τῶν ὄντων τὰ μὲν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἔθετο ὁ Θεός, τὰ δ' οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῶν. Ἐφ' ἡμῶν μὲν τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ σπουδαιότατον ᾧ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς εὐδαίμων ἐστί, τὴν χρῆσιν τῶν φαντασιῶν . . . τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἐποιήσατο. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς συμψήφους χρὴ τῷ θεῷ γενέσθαι . . . (Stobaeus, Wach. and Hense, Lib. II, cap. viii. 30). In the time of Agrippina and Nero such a doctrine if applied to politics would lead to a waiting policy and to much renunciation. It was based on an orthodox study of the Stoic physics (see Stobaeus *Flor.*, Meineke cviii. 60) and on careful study of syllogistic logic (Arrian, *Epict.* i. 7. 32). Nature's work was shown to be the fitting of a man's impulse to the insight which he had of what is right and useful (Stobaeus, W. & H., Γ. xx. 60). The condition of the bad man was shown to be the contemptible and feeble one of inability to harm or help (*ibid.* xx. 61). He taught that power was best seen in the making of men better (*ibid.* xix. 13). But stern discipline was required for this, and some young men were unequal to the test (Arrian, *Epict.* iii. 6. 10). Self-reliance must be learned (*ibid.* i. 9. 29, 30), and deep heart-searching conference must be held with the teacher (*ibid.* iii. 23. 29). The duty in hand must be carefully done (*ibid.* i. 7. 32).

In the first eight years of Nero's reign the young satirist Persius was probably much in Rome, and we can hardly suppose that with eyes wide open as his were to all the city sights and city literature, he, a pupil of the Stoic Cornutus, would neglect to inform himself of so striking a teacher as Musonius. Perhaps we have an echo of some conference with Musonius, which he may have attended along with other young men of political promise, in the fourth satire of Persius. Musonius must often have found it necessary to deal with young aspirants for honor who knew the theories of right and wrong as well as Alcibiades (a good representative of Nero) is said in the

satire to have known. Nor are the references to flattery of the people other than most appropriate to Nero's way of winning favor with the amusement loving throng at Rome. But the young statesman who wished, as Musonius's friends evidently did, to restore the old Roman manners, had to be led by the way of self-examination and repentance and self-reliance. *Τοιγαροῦν*, says Epictetus, *οὕτως ἔλεγεν, ὥσθ' ἕκαστον ἡμῶν καθήμενον οἶεσθαι, ὅτι τις ποτε αὐτὸν διαβέβληκεν· οὕτως ἤπτετο τῶν γινομένων, οὕτω πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἐτίθει τὰ ἐκάστου κακά* (Epict. iii. 23. 29). Compare Persius iv. 23 :

Ut nemo in sese temptat descendere, nemo.

and again iv. 42 seq.:

Caedimus, inque vicem praebeamus crura sagittis.
Vivitur hoc pacto; sic novimus. Ilia subter
Caecum vulnus habes; sed lato balteus auro
Protegit. Ut mavis da verba et decipe nervos
Si potes. "Egregium cum me vicinia dicat,
Non credam?" Viso si palles, improbe, nummo,
.
Nequiquam populo bibulas donaveris aures.
Respue quod non es; tollat sua munera Cerdo;
Tecum habita; noris quam sit tibi curta suppellex.

This satire has the ring of the teacher of Epictetus. Again, in the first satire, by way of protest against the Neronian littérateurs, we have (i. 7)

nec te quaesiveris extra

and i. 26, 27

O mores! usque adeone

Scire tuum nihil est, nisi te scire hoc sciat alter? . . .

Again in the third satire is a passage which no doubt would be in the spirit of the political Stoics among whom Musonius was a power, iii. 35-38 :

Magne pater divom, saevos punire tyrannos
Haud alia ratione velis, cum dira libido
Moverit ingenium ferventi tincta veneno;
Virtutem videant intabescantque relictā.

But not all the Stoic passages of Persius show the Musonian stamp. The passage in ii. 61 seq., "*O curvae in terris animae,*" with the long

description of the work of the flesh, has more of an oriental and Pythagorean flavor, such as we find at times in Seneca, then in the height of his influence, but not harmonious with the Musonian school. In the third satire the exhortations to learn the sort of life we ought to lead, and in the fifth satire the warning against procrastination in finding the true end of life, together with the excellent sermon on liberty, — all these are more in the vein of what Persius would learn from the moral instruction of his private tutor Cornutus. I think the passages quoted at length may give us some idea of the effect of Musonius's teaching on high-spirited earnest young men. Nor were older men such as Thrasea, Soranus, and Helvidius likely to keep out of the influence of the stern magnetic teacher as the villainy of Nero's reign deepened, and all compromise with his works and ways was seen to be impossible. Thrasea had shown himself no puritan in early days; at a great festival in his native Patavium he put on the tragic dress and sang. He often travelled and took with him on his journeys Persius, whose training in Horace gave him a good dash of Epicurean love for the pleasures of life. But after Persius's death in 62, warned by the fate of Rubellius in 63, finding that senatorial action was useless and Nero unfriendly, Thrasea began to abstain from useless forms of effort and to gather round him a company of bold protestants. "*Habet sectatores vel potius satellites qui nondum contumaciam sententiarum, sed habitum vultumque eius sectantur, rigidi et tristes, quo tibi lasciviam exprobrent.*" Such language is put into the mouth of Nero's courtier by Tacitus (*Ann.* xvi. 22). Here we catch a sight of the dress and demeanor which we have learned to associate with Musonius's friends. In Arrian's *Epictetus*, we find Musonius trying to train Thrasea to that complete indifference which Epictetus learned so thoroughly (i. 1, 27). Probably the necessities of that hard time morally forced puritanism upon Thrasea, and when converted he became the political captain of the movement whose prophet was Musonius. But Rufus especially influenced the studies of young men, some of whom we can probably name. There was in that company of Thrasea, Arulenus Rusticus, "*flagrans juvenis*" who wanted to veto the condemnation of Thrasea at the risk of life. There was Curtius Montanus who won Nero's enmity, so gossip said, "*quia protulerit ingenium,*" perhaps in the form of

satire that sounded libellous (Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 28, 29). Montanus might perhaps seem a bolder successor of Persius. That he was of a fiery, eager nature is shown by the effect of his oratory a few years later as described in Tac. *Hist.* iv. 42 and 43. Older perhaps and more self-contained was Paconius Agrippinus whose father had been killed by Tiberius. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐπαινεῖν Ἀγριππῖνον δίκαιον, ὅτι πλείστον ἄξιος ἀνὴρ γενόμενος, οὐδεπώποτε ἐπήνεσεν ἑαυτόν· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ἄλλός τις αὐτὸν ἐπῆνει, ἡρυσθρία. οὗτος δ', ἔφη, ὁ ἀνὴρ τοιοῦτος ἦν, ὥστε τοῦ συμβαίνοντος αἰεὶ ἑαυτῷ δυσκόλον ἔπαινον γράφειν· εἰ μὲν πυρέττοι, πυρετοῦ· εἰ δὲ ἀδοξοῖ, ἀδοξίας· εἰ δὲ φύγοι φυγῆς (Epictetus, Schweighaeuser, Tom. III, Fragmenta lvi). Here the lesson of content with circumstances had been thoroughly learned, and the searching rebukes of Musonius had taken deep effect. This man was banished at the time when Thrasea was killed and Helvidius sent out of Italy. Ἀπηγγέθη αὐτῷ ὅτι, Κρίνη ἐν συγκλήτῳ. Ἀγαθὴ τύχη. Ἀλλὰ ἦλθεν ἡ πέμπτη· ταύτη δ' εἰώθει γυμνασάμενος ψυχρολυτρεῖν· ἀπέλθωμεν καὶ γυμνασθῶμεν. Γυμνασαμένῳ λέγει τις αὐτῷ ἔλθων ὅτι, Κατακέκρισαι. Φυγῇ, φησὶν ἢ θανάτῳ; Φυγῇ. Τᾷ ὑπάρχοντα τί; Οὐκ ἀφηρέθη. Εἰς Ἀρίκειαν οὖν ἀπελθόντες ἀριστήσωμεν (Arrian, *Epicteti Dissert.* i. 1. 28-30). Here we have the dramatic posing so characteristic of Musonius's disciples, but to estimate it rightly we must remember it was their means of political and moral protest, and was very effective in establishing their doctrine. Among the many young men who were in this company we must remember the slave Epictetus whom Rufus taught as carefully as any. Annius Pollio, the husband of Servilia, daughter of Soranus, may have been especially bold in this Stoic opposition, for he was of course well known to Musonius, and was banished with him before Thrasea was attacked. That Nero should suspect Musonius as the prophet of the republican Stoics was most natural, as also that finding Thrasea holding the party together he should next year kill him and banish his violent son-in-law; for Musonius had done his work well. A lofty ideal purpose had been breathed into the opponents of the Julian house, and the spirit of martyrs had been given them. When Galba was set on the throne the Stoics became active at once. Musonius indeed would not recognize Galba's death as proving lack of Providence, nor his life as proving the fact of Providence, but his brief rule had given a chance

to the new life which Otho and Vitellius could not destroy. Still at first this new life was eager and revengeful. Helvidius Priscus tried to punish Eprius Marcellus, the accuser of Thræsea, and Curtius Montanus tried to destroy the power of Regulus; nor can Musonius have failed in sympathy with his disciples, for he made a successful effort to punish the traitorous Egnatius Celer. (Tac. *Hist.* iv. 6-10; 40-43.) However, the Stoics tried to make peace between the Vitellians and the Flavians. Arulenus Rusticus, then praetor, was wounded on the embassy by the soldiers of Cerialis,—and Musonius, equestrian though he was, went down among the common soldiers of Primus Antonius, and talked of the blessings of peace and the perils of war till they nearly thrust him out of the camp. (Tac. *Hist.* iii. 80, 81.)

When, however, Vespasian was thoroughly established in power there came a schism in the party. Some, like Helvidius, insulted the emperor till he killed Helvidius and banished the rest; these saw in him still the possible and in some ways actual tyrant. But Musonius must have recognized the improvement, and seen the uselessness of further revolution. He knew what was and what was not in his power. He saw no interference with his essential liberty on the part of the first Flavian. Vespasian retained him at Rome when others were banished, and Titus was his friend. Meantime he could still train young men. Arulenus Rusticus lived on, and a Montanus who seems to be the same as Curtius received two letters from Pliny (vii. 29 and viii. 6). In token of his identity, note the description of him at the end of viii. 6 "*scio quam sit tibi vivus et ingenuus animus,*" and observe Pliny's expectation of full sympathy in anger against the flatterers of Pallas. Herennius Senecio may also have been a pupil of Musonius. At any rate he with Arulenus was active for justice and against such men as Regulus (Pliny *Ep.* i. 5; vii. 33). Pliny himself as a very young man admired and loved the great teacher, and though Musonius probably died early in Domitian's reign, as we have argued above, yet his party lived on to furnish new martyrs in the last gloomy years of the same period. In Trajan's reign the men who revered the earlier saints of the sect were high in favor. In the second century, Stoic philosophy was powerful at court. Musonius, through his party's victory, and through the moral

influence of Epictetus, was then a power in the world. Meantime another Musonius had arisen, named from Babylon, or Tyre, or both, better known than Rufus to the eastern and Christian world. Two epigrams given by Plutarch (*De Ira*, 2; *De Vitando Ære Alieno*, 7) may refer to either philosopher, but have a Roman air, and Plutarch certainly knew Arulenus Rusticus (*De Curiositate*, 15). The distinction which has been made between the two Musonii is, it is true, contradicted by Suidas, but he may easily have confused the two, especially if the eastern one was sometimes called the Tyrian, and so easily confused with the Tyrrhenian. Certainly the Suidas lexicon has made a great error in attributing to Asinius Pollio, of the time of Pompey the Great (s.v. Πωλίων), the authorship of ἀπομνημονεύματα Μουσωνίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου. Perhaps the name of Annius Pollio is here corrupted and misplaced; the son-in-law of Soranus may have written down a memoir, now lost, of Rufus, while in the next century Lucius reported conversations held with Musonius of Tyre. As regards the words (s.v. Μουσώνιος) ὁ δὲ ἐπεμέλετο βαρῶν ὀπηρῖκα φεύγειν αὐτὸν ἐπέταττε Νέρων, that they are not clear in meaning I agree with Nieuwland, whose able dissertation has been a great help to me as to so many others on the whole subject of Musonius. Only one emperor after Nero was opposed to Musonius and his friends, and our Roman knight was long afterwards represented by descendants and known to fame in Italy. See the inscription by Avienus (*Anthol. Meyer*, I, 278) where "*Festus, Musoni suboles*," "*lare cretus Volsiniensi*," dedicates a monument amid Italian surroundings, and lives a life, if we may trust his own description, worthy of his puritan ancestor "*vitam insons, integer ævom*," and boasting of his wife and children, ends with a contrast between the spirit of man and circumstance, which repeats in happier surroundings the old doctrine of Rufus and Epictetus:

vivax et spiritus ollis;

Cetera composita fatorum lege trahentur.